



1-1-1948

# Quotations from the Septuagint in the Synoptic Gospels

Albert H. Fauth  
*Butler University*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.butler.edu/grtheses>

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [Christianity Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Fauth, Albert H., "Quotations from the Septuagint in the Synoptic Gospels" (1948). *Graduate Thesis Collection*. Paper 332.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Scholarship at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact [fgaede@butler.edu](mailto:fgaede@butler.edu).

(This certification-sheet is to be bound with the thesis. The major professor should have it filled out at the oral examination.)

Name of candidate:

Albert H. Fauth

Oral examination:

Date May 17, 1948

Committee:

S. Marion Smith, Chairman

Toyozo W. Nakarai

David C. Pellatt

Thesis title:

Quotations From the  
Septuagint in the  
Synoptic Gospels

Thesis approved in final form:

Date May 28, 1948

Major Professor S. Marion Smith

(Please return this certification-sheet, along with two copies of the thesis and the candidate's record, to the Graduate Office, Room 105, Jordan Hall. The third copy of the thesis should be returned to the candidate immediately after the oral examination.)

31  
11

QUOTATIONS FROM THE SEPTUAGINT

IN

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

By  
ALBERT H. FAUTH

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts

DIVISION OF GRADUATE INSTRUCTION

BUTLER UNIVERSITY

INDIANAPOLIS

1948

QUOTATIONS FROM THE SEPTUAGINT

IN

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

BY

ALBERT H. FAUTH



## FOREWORD

"The Quotations From the Septuagint in the Synoptic Gospels" is the result of a statement made in the Septuagint Class concerning the relation between the quotations of the Septuagint as found in the New Testament. An objective study ensued with the purpose of gathering together these quotations in a comparative study and a tabulation of the results. The study was greatly stimulated by H. B. Swete's "An Introduction to the Old Testament in the Greek", especially his chapter on the quotations from the Old Testament as found in the New Testament. His list of quotations was compared with that of Westcott and Hort in the back of their "The New Testament in the Greek" and also Erwin Nestle's Greek Testament in which he lists the quotations in bold-faced type. Because of the thoroughness and completeness of Dr. Swete's list, it has been used as the basis of this investigation.

I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor S. Marion Smith and Instructor David C. Pellett for their suggestions and advice in the pursuit of this study. I also wish to express appreciation to Mrs. Albert Fauth for her work in the typing of this paper.

It is hoped that a further interest and investigation will be made in the remaining books of the New Testament in the near future.

A. F.

Plainfield, Indiana, 1948

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD . . . . .	Page iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS . . . . .	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE SEPTUAGINT . . . . .	1
Its Origin	
Manuscripts and Recensions	
The Present Text	
II. QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW . . . . .	8
Passages Which Agree With the LXX	
Passages Which Disagree Textually With the LXX	
Adapting a prophetic context	
Loose citation	
Difference in translation	
Fusing together of passages	
Difference in order	
Passages Which Disagree Widely With the LXX	
III. QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK . . . . .	33
Passages Which Agree With the LXX	
Passages Which Disagree Textually With the LXX	
Adapting a prophetic context	
Loose citation	
Difference in translation	
Fusing together of passages	
Difference in order	

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

IV. QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE . . . . .	42
Passages Which Agree With the LXX	
Passages Which Disagree Textually With the LXX	
Adapting a prophetic context	
Difference in translation	
Fusing together of passages	
Difference in order	
Passage With Radical Differences	
V. COMPARISON OF THE SYNOPTIC QUOTATIONS . . . . .	49
Passages Which Are Similar	
Passages Which Differ	
VI. CONCLUSION . . . . .	55
LIST OF QUOTATIONS IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS . . . . .	59
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	61

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

LXX	-	the Septuagint
LXX $\mathcal{N}$	-	Codex Sinaiticus
LXX A	-	Codex Alexandrinus
LXX B	-	Codex Vaticanus
LXX C	-	Codex Ephraemi
LXX D	-	Codex Cottonianus Geneseos
LXX E	-	Codex Bodleianus Geneseos
LXX F	-	Codex Ambrosianus
LXX Q	-	Codex Marchalianus
LXX Z	-	Fragmenta rescripta Tischendorfiana Isaiae prophetae
LXX $\Gamma$	-	Codex rescriptus Cryptoferratensis
LXX A <sup>1</sup>	-	Correction of original scribe
LXX B <sup>abmg</sup>	-	a, b are second and third hand corrections; mg-marginal reading
M. T.	-	Masoretic Text
MSS.	-	Manuscripts



## QUOTATIONS FROM THE SEPTUAGINT

### IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

#### CHAPTER I

#### INTRODUCTION TO THE SEPTUAGINT

The greatest disaster to shake the national and religious life of Judaism was the *διασπορά*. It was indicative of failure on the part of the Hebrews to faithfully discharge the responsibility entrusted them by Jehovah. This responsibility was that of disseminating monotheism, or their knowledge of the true and living God, to the nations of the world. The *διασπορά* came upon the heels of their backslidings from monotheism into heathenish polytheism. This scattering was in two directions--East and West. Those in the East held tenaciously to traditional Judaism; but those in the West unconsciously accepted the customs of their adopted country. With the coming of Greek domination through Alexander the Great, these Westerners became known as Hellenists from *ἑλληνίζειν*, to conform or take the customs and language of the Greeks.<sup>1</sup> It is through them that the Septuagint translation came into existence. Inasmuch as our study will deal with "Quotations From the Septuagint in the Synoptic Gospels", it will be necessary for us to become acquainted with an account of the events that originated the Septuagint to its present existence.

---

<sup>1</sup>Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (8th ed., New York: 1910), Vol. I., p. 17.

### Its Origin

Someone has said that "necessity is the mother of invention", and this was true in the making of the Septuagint Bible. The Jews who had been brought into contact with Hellenistic customs and language found themselves, in time, unable to read the Bible written in the Hebrew language. "The Hellenistic Jews spoke Greek, prayed in Greek, sang Psalms in Greek, wrote in Greek, produced Greek literature; further, their best minds thought in Greek."<sup>1</sup> Out of this exigency came forth the need of a Bible written in the language of their adopted country.

Long before Alexander the Great had conquered the world, some of the Jews had gone to Egypt through an Egyptian invasion as hostages and captives. When Alexander built Alexandria in the land of Egypt, he gave the Jews a place in the new city.<sup>2</sup> Following Alexander's death, the Ptolemies added to the Jewish population until by the time of the Christian era they numbered more than a million.<sup>3</sup> The great need for a Bible that they could use in their synagogue was inevitable. According to tradition found in Josephus, Philo, and the purported letter of one Aristeas, Ptolemaeus Philadelphus, king of Egypt, with the cooperation of the Jewish high-priest of Jerusalem, ordered the translation

---

<sup>1</sup>G. Adolph Deissman, Bible Studies (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901), p. 70.

<sup>2</sup>H. B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge at the University Press, 1900), p. 5.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid, p. 7.



of the Hebrew Bible into Greek.<sup>1</sup>

The manner in which the translation was accomplished is shrouded with much superstition. Seventy scholars, from whence comes the term Septuagint, were brought to Alexandria where they translated the Pentateuch into Greek.<sup>2</sup> The stories that grew out of this event will not be discussed here because of their pseudonymous and legendary character. Modern scholars have accepted the Alexandrian version of the law in the days of Philadelphus.<sup>3</sup>

Our interest lies primarily in the language that was used, for this is what influenced the writers of the New Testament with their use of the LXX. Swete says:

"The Greek which the Jews of Alexandria learnt to speak was neither the literary language of the scholars nor that of Hellenistic writers of second or first century B. C. It was based on the patois of the Alexandrian streets and markets--a mixture, as we may suppose, of the ancient spoken tongue of Hellas with elements gathered from Macedonia, Asia Minor, Egypt, and Libya. In to this hybrid speech the Jewish colony would infuse, when it became their usual organ of communication, a strong coloring of Semitic thought, and not a few reminiscences of Hebrew or Aramaic lexicography and grammar. Such, at any rate, is the monument of Jewish-Egyptian Greek which survives in the earlier books of the so-called Septuagint."<sup>4</sup>

Deissmann calls it the Egypto-Alexandrian dialect, a Semitic Greek which

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles A. Briggs, General Introduction to the Holy Scripture (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), p. 124.

<sup>2</sup>Frankel proposes the idea that the LXX was a Greek Targum which grew out of the needs in the Egyptian synagogue, much like the Palestinian and Babylonian Targums - Charles A. Briggs, op. cit., p. 125.

<sup>3</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 17.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid, p. 9.

no one ever spoke either before or after.<sup>1</sup> But, it left its imprint upon the New Testament. The relation between the language used in the LXX and the New Testament is exhaustively treated by Hatch<sup>2</sup> and Kennedy.<sup>3</sup> There is a great deal of similarity found in the two vocabularies. One wonders what the New Testament would be if the writers had not used the LXX. Kennedy says, "The language of the LXX will be found to be the basis upon which the New Testament structure is reared."<sup>4</sup>

#### Manuscripts and Recensions

The remainder of the Bible was translated and added to the Pentateuch as the books were added to the Hebrew canon and sent from Palestine. This process continued until by the time of the Christian era, Alexandria possessed the whole or nearly the whole of the Hebrew Scripture in a Greek translation.<sup>5</sup> Evidence attesting to this fact is found in various sources. The writer of the prologue of Sirach, who arrived in Egypt in the thirty-eighth year of Euergetes, i. e., in 132 B. C., uses the words "Law", "Prophets", and "the rest of the books" which were current in a translation.<sup>6</sup> Philo in the first century A. D., also used the LXX and quoted largely from many of its books. There are two other sources:

---

<sup>1</sup>G. Adolph Deissmann, op. cit., pp. 66,67.

<sup>2</sup>Edwin Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1889).

<sup>3</sup>H. A. A. Kennedy, Sources of New Testament Greek (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 38 George St., 1895).

<sup>4</sup>Ibid, p. 10.

<sup>5</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 25.

<sup>6</sup>Charles A. Briggs, op. cit., p. 189;  
H. A. A. Kennedy, op. cit., p. 24.



the writers of the New Testament who quoted from the Old Testament in Greek, and Josephus who knew and used the LXX.

The completion of the translation received wide acclaim and acceptance. It became not only the Bible of the Greek-speaking Jews in Alexandria and Egypt, but of all Jews in the countries in and around the Mediterranean Sea.<sup>1</sup> It was copied and recopied during the succeeding centuries by scribes of varying intelligence. Errors were multiplied and the two texts, Hebrew and LXX, began to differ more and more from each other.

Because of these scribal errors and its use by the Christian Church Fathers polemically, e. g., the use of *παρθεῖος* in Isaiah 7:14 for *יְהוָה*, it was increasingly unsatisfactory to the Jewish schools of interpretation. Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus attempted to provide a text which would correct this hostility. Aquila, in the first half of the second century A. D., translated the Hebrew scriptures into Greek independently of the LXX. It was received with favor by the Jews but mistrusted by the Christians.<sup>2</sup> Theodotion followed with another Greek version which was a revision of the LXX to conform with the official text.<sup>3</sup> Symmachus followed with an attempt to make a better Greek version of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Ira M. Price, The Ancestry of our English Bible (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937), 11th edition, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 41.

<sup>3</sup>Charles A. Briggs, op. cit., p. 192.

of the Old Testament from the Christian point of view.<sup>1</sup> He used Aquila, LXX, and Theodotion.

Later attempts were made to preserve the original text of the Greek Old Testament. Origen at Caesarea (232-254 A. D.) made the first effort with his Hexapla which contained the Hebrew, a Hebrew transliteration, Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, and a revision of the LXX. Price says, "When we consider that the Hebrew and LXX texts used by Origen were divergences from the original text in the second and third centuries B.C., we begin to appreciate how rapidly the errors of the scribes must have multiplied."<sup>2</sup> Hesychius revised the text of the entire Bible in Alexandria, and it became the official text of the Egyptian Church. Lucian, the martyr (311 A. D.), made another independent attempt of revision of the entire Greek Bible at Antioch. Thus, by the beginning of the fourth century, A.D., there were three Greek texts of the Bible in use.<sup>3</sup>

#### The Present Text

The critic in endeavoring to arrive at a text which may be close to the original will find himself with not one manuscript containing the original LXX translation of the Hebrew Bible (c 100 B.C., lost)<sup>4</sup> but scores of Greek manuscripts, uncial and cursive, each one containing

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ira M. Price, op. cit., p. 115.

<sup>3</sup>Charles A. Briggs, op. cit., p. 193.

<sup>4</sup>Donald L. Hoffman, An Examination of ׀׀׀ as it Occurs in the Masoretic Text Studied in Light of the Septuagint. Unpublished Dissertation, Department of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, (1942), p. 4.



a text differing from the other to a greater or lesser degree.<sup>1</sup> Briggs has classified them into: Neutral texts, Vatican codex (B. 4th century), Sinaitic codex (X 4th century); Egyptian texts, Alexandria (A 5th century), Ephraem codex (C 5th century); Western texts, Bezae codex (D).<sup>2</sup> Of these manuscripts, Vatican (B) belonging to Neutral texts, i. e., (according to Westcott and Hort) a text free from corruptions which came in all the subsequent revisions, is considered the best.

These manuscripts along with some recensions were used by several authors who published various printed texts of the Greek Bible. A few of them are: Erasmus whose 1519 edition was used by Luther, Beza (1565-1604), Elzevirs (1633 edition, called the received text of N. T.), Bengel (1734), Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and Swete (1787-1894, based upon a corrected text of B).<sup>3</sup>

The text we shall use for this dissertation is the one edited by H. B. Swete in its latest revised editions.<sup>4</sup> Swete follows largely the Vatican (B) manuscripts, but where it is defective or lacking the Alexandrine (A), and in a few instances where both fail him, he uses the uncial manuscripts which occupy the next phase of importance.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Harold R. Willoughby, The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow, Current Progress and Problems in Septuagint Research, Harry M. Orlinsky, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois (1947), p. 145.

<sup>2</sup>Charles A. Briggs, op. cit., pp. 195-203.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid, pp. 206-209.

<sup>4</sup>H. B. Swete, The Old Testament in the Greek According to the Septuagint, Cambridge at University Press,  
Vol. I, (1909), 4th edition  
Vol. II, (1907), 3rd edition  
Vol. III, (1912), 4th edition.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid, Vol. I., p.xif.

## CHAPTER II

### QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

Before we examine the passages used by the writer of the Gospel of Matthew, it will be necessary to say that we will be dealing with only the direct citations. There are many more references from the Old Testament than these, but they are mere allusions and reminiscences.<sup>1</sup> An exhaustive and complete list has been prepared and printed by Westcott and Hort;<sup>2</sup> also a complete system will be found in the Greek Testament edited by Dr. Erwin Nestle who prints the LXX references in bold or black-face type.<sup>3</sup> By direct citations, we refer to (1) "those which are cited with an introductory formula, such as τοῦτο γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ρηθὲν (Mt.), οὕτως or καθὼς γέγραπται, or γέγραπται simply (Mt., Mk., Lk.,); . . . (2) those which, though not announced by a formula, appear from the context to be intended as quotations, or agree verbatim with some context in the Old Testament."<sup>4</sup> A good example is found in Matthew 19:4,5:

4. οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ὁ χτίσας ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀρσεν καὶ θῆλυ  
ἐποίησεν αὐτούς;

<sup>1</sup>H. B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in the Greek, p. 381.

<sup>2</sup>Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek (New York: Macmillan Company, 1941), p. 602ff.

<sup>3</sup>Erwin Nestle, Greek New Testament (American Bible Society, New York, 1935), 16th edition.

<sup>4</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 382.



5. καὶ εἶπεν· ἐνθάδε τούτο καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ κολληθήσεται τῇ γυναίκὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἑσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.

The underlined portion of verse four is an allusion or an indirect reference. Jesus, in answering the question of the Pharisees, incorporates that which is recorded in Genesis 1:27 but does not use it as a direct quotation. But the following verse, though not introduced as a direct quotation, is an appropriate example of (2) above. I have examined a goodly number of these allusions and reminiscences, and found them generally in agreement with the Septuagint. It is the quotations with which we shall deal that present the difficult problems.

Of the Synoptic writers, Matthew contains the most references and quotations from the Old Testament. There are a total of forty-four quotations in the Synoptic Gospels. Forty of these are found in Matthew, eighteen in Mark, and seventeen in Luke. Eighteen of these are peculiar to Matthew, Mark and Luke; three are common to Matthew and Mark, four to Matthew and Luke, but none are found in Mark and Luke to the exclusion of Matthew.<sup>1</sup> It might be of further interest to note that of these forty citations in Matthew, nine are from Isaiah; six each from Deuteronomy, Psalms and Exodus; three from Hosea and Zechariah; two from Leviticus and Jeremiah; and one each from Genesis, Daniel, Micah, and Malachi.

We come now to our examination of the passages quoted by Matthew from the Old Testament. The investigation will be limited to those passages found in Matthew. It will be in the nature of an objective study, with

---

<sup>1</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 391f.

our conclusions arrived at after our investigation of Mark and Luke. Several of the passages treated in Matthew will be found also in Mark and Luke, but they will receive our attention when we discuss the passages in those Gospels. We shall deal with each passage in the Greek, compare it with the LXX, and then check the M. T. where necessary.

#### Passages Which Agree With The LXX

It will be necessary here only to mention or perhaps give an example of these passages. Of Matthew's forty citations used, fifteen agree verbally with the LXX. The fifteen passages are:

Matthew 3:3	with	Isaiah 40:3
Matthew 4:4	with	Deuteronomy 8:3
Matthew 4:7	with	Deuteronomy 6:16
Matthew 5:21	with	Exodus 20: (13) 15
Matthew 5:27	with	Exodus 20: (14) 13
Matthew 5:38	with	Exodus 21:24
Matthew 5:43	with	Leviticus 19:18
Matthew 9:13	with	Hosea 6:6
Matthew 12:7	with	Hosea 6:6
Matthew 13:14f	with	Isaiah 6:9f
Matthew 21:16	with	Psalms 8:2
Matthew 21:42	with	Psalms 117:22f
Matthew 22:32	with	Exodus 3:6
Matthew 22:39	with	Leviticus 19:18
Matthew 24:15	with	Daniel 12:11

The following is an example:

λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασιν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας· παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ ἔστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς

ἡρώων New Testament, Matthew 21:42

λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασιν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας. Παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ ἔστι θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡρώων Lxx, Psalm 117:22,23

Upon examining the remaining fourteen, the reader will discover the same verbal agreements.



Attention might be called to the passage in 3:3 where he omits the words of the LXX τοῦ θεοῦ ἡγῶν and uses the word αὐτοῦ which probably refers to Κυρίου.<sup>1</sup> This was done perhaps to fit the prophecy to the occasion. Also, there is a change in order found in 13:14f. The αὐτῶν is omitted before βαρέως and follows ὀφθαλμοῦς, but in the LXX αὐτῶν precedes βαρέως. The passage in Matthew agrees with the LXX A. In 9:13, the translation agrees with the LXX A and the Hebrew which we will accept over against the LXX B. The LXX A has καὶ οὗ which is similar to the Matthew text but omitted by LXX B. Matthew usually follows LXX A which we shall see as we continue. These three differences are not pronounced enough to keep them out of this group.

#### Passages Which Disagree Textually With the LXX

This group contains the majority of Matthew's quotations with problems that grow out of textual differences. We shall discover that the problems are due to one of the following: an adapting of the text to a prophetic context, a loose citation of the text, a difference in translation, a fusing together of passages from different contexts, and a difference in order.<sup>2</sup>

The passages which we shall consider are:

Matthew 1:23	with	Isaiah 7:14
Matthew 2:15	with	Hosea 11:1
Matthew 2:18	with	Jeremiah 31:15

---

<sup>1</sup>B. T. D. Smith, Cambridge Greek Testament (London: Cambridge at the University Press, 1927), p. 82.

<sup>2</sup>I am indebted to H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 394, for the suggested problem areas, although I find myself in disagreement with a few of the passages cited.

Matthew 4:6	with	Psalm 91:11
Matthew 4:10	with	Deuteronomy 6:13
Matthew 5:31	with	Deuteronomy 24:1
Matthew 11:10	with	Malachi 3:1
Matthew 12:18-21	with	Isaiah 42:1-4
Matthew 15:4	with	Exodus 20:12; 21:16
Matthew 15:8f	with	Isaiah 29:13
Matthew 19:5f	with	Genesis 2:24
Matthew 19:18f	with	Exodus 20:12-17
Matthew 21:4f	with	Isaiah 62:4
Matthew 21:13	with	Isaiah 56:7
Matthew 22:24	with	Deuteronomy 25:5
Matthew 22:37	with	Deuteronomy 6:4f
Matthew 22:44	with	Psalm 109:1
Matthew 24:15	with	Daniel 12:11
Matthew 26:31	with	Zechariah 13:7
Matthew 27:46	with	Psalm 21:1

Adapting of the text to a prophetic context. - Our first textual problem is found in Matthew 1:23 where we find two words in disagreement with the LXX. Matthew has ἔξει and καλέσουσιν whereas the LXX has λήγνυται and καλέσεις. ἔξει and λήγνυται are both in the future tense with the same person and number, and can be translated with the verb "to have". However, such is not the case with the words καλέσουσιν and καλέσεις which differ in number. Differences of opinion are voiced by several scholars. Some would limit their explanations to purely textual, while others depart from the text to find their answers in the field of interpretation. McNeile explains καλέσουσιν as "a periphrasis, more Aramaic, for the passive λήγνυται", and suggests that the passage was correct in Matthew's time in an Aramaic translation from the Hebrew and formed part of a collection of Testimonia.<sup>1</sup> Böhl thinks Matthew

---

<sup>1</sup>A. H. McNeile, Gospel According to Matthew (London: Macmillan and Company, 1938), p. 9.



followed a Volksbibel which existed with a translation of Isaiah 7:14 and both of these textual departures were used.<sup>1</sup> Others, like Allen,<sup>2</sup> Smith,<sup>3</sup> and Vincent,<sup>4</sup> think it is due to an adaptation of the text to a prophetic fulfillment. Vincent says, "Matthew generalizes the singular into the plural, and quotes the prophecy in a form suited to its larger fulfillment."<sup>5</sup> "They shall call His name", i. e., the people shall call His name; in other words, He will be recognized as "God with us". This is the probable reason for the differences as recorded.

Another similar problem is found in Matthew 2:15 where we have ἔχάλεσα τὸν οἶόν μου, but in the LXX, Hosea 11:1 μετακάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ. In this instance Matthew adheres closely to the M. T. whereas the LXX B departs therefrom. There can be no doubt that the LXX is in error, perhaps due to a scribe who thought the statement referred to the children of Israel's deliverance from Egypt as recorded in Exodus. This is seen in the use of μετακαλέω which, according to Thayer means "to call from one place to another".<sup>6</sup> cf. Acts 7:14; 10:32; 20:17. Böhl claims that the LXX translation does not lean toward a

---

<sup>1</sup>Eduard Böhl, Die Altestamentlichen Citate in Neuen Testament (Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1878), p. 5f.

<sup>2</sup>Willoughby C. Allen, International Critical Commentary, Matthew (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), p. 10.

<sup>3</sup>B. T. D. Smith, op. cit., p. 21.

<sup>4</sup>M. R. Vincent, Word Studies in the New Testament, Synoptic Gospels (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918) Vol. I., p. 18.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid, p. 18.

<sup>6</sup>J. H. Thayer, Greek in English Lexicon of New Testament (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1892), p. 405.

Messiahship; but the Volksbibel which he used did, and he therefore chose it to fit his need.<sup>1</sup> Lenski says, "Matthew naturally discarded the LXX with its plural τὰ τέσσαρα, which is well for general purposes, but not nearly exact enough for what the prophet really says and what Matthew intends to use."<sup>2</sup> Matthew leaves the LXX and follows the M. T. which is more exact and adaptable to his prophetic message and its interpretation.

This next passage is of special interest in that it is recorded as a quotation from the lips of Satan. In the temptation, Christ answers him with the Scriptures, and immediately he answers Christ in like manner. Our problem here is one of omissions. The passage in Matthew 4:6 is the same in Psalm 91:11 with the exception that Matthew omits τοῦ διαφολᾶσαι σε ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς σου. There can be no doubt here of the Devil's attempt to adapt a passage for his own evil intent. "So the Devil quotes the Word of God, misinterprets it, omits a clause, and tries to trip the Son of God by the Word of God."<sup>3</sup>

There are several words of disagreement in Matthew 11:10 with Malachi 3:1 in the LXX B. Ἀποστέλλω is used by Matthew but ἐξαποστέλλω by LXX; however, Gesenius says that the LXX uses both in the translation of the Hebrew מְשִׁיחַ.<sup>4</sup> Matthew also uses ὅς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν

<sup>1</sup>Eduard Böhl, op. cit., p. 10.

<sup>2</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel (Columbus, Ohio: The Wartbury Press, 1943), p. 76f.

<sup>3</sup>A. T. Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament, Matthew and Mark (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930), Vol. I., p. 32.

<sup>4</sup>William Gesenius, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1866), 12th ed., p. 1068.

Brown, Driver, Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1906), p. 805.



σου ἔμπροσθέν σου and the LXX καὶ ἐπιβλεψέται ὁδὸν  
 πρὸ προσώπου μου. Mark and Luke agree with Matthew, but Mark omits  
 ἔμπροσθέν σου. Matthew's κατασχευάσει is closer to the Hebrew  
 which means to clear a house or a road, in the Piel; but in the Qal the  
 meaning is to turn, to turn the back.<sup>1</sup> It would have been an easy matter  
 for the translator of the LXX to use the Qal, which he did here, in-  
 stead of the Piel, for the original Hebrew did not have the vowel  
 system used today. The thing that bothers us most is the change of  
 μου (LXX B) to σου (Matthew). An adequate reason is found in Alford's  
 comment:

"Our Lord here changes the person of the original  
 prophecy, which is μου. And that He does so, making that which  
 is said by Jehovah of Himself, to be addressed to the Messiah, is  
 if such were needed (compare also Luke 1:16,17, and 76), no mean  
 indication of His own eternal and co-equal God-head."<sup>2</sup>

That this is another case of adapting a prophetic context to the cir-  
 cumstances under which it was to have been fulfilled is quite obvious.  
 Jesus uses a Messianic passage and applies it to the relationship of  
 John the Baptist to His ministry.<sup>3</sup> However, McNeile thinks these words  
 were not spoken by Jesus but were inserted editorially by Matthew.<sup>4</sup>  
 This could be possible, but is probably better to accept them as gen-  
 uine and then explain them in their context as we have done.

<sup>1</sup>Ibid, p. 850; Eduard Böhl, op. cit., p. 36.

<sup>2</sup>Henry Alford, The Greek Testament, The Four Gospels, Vol. I, 6th edition, (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Company, 1868), p. 116.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 729.

<sup>4</sup>A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 154.

Our next passage in Matthew 19:5f and Genesis 2:24 adheres closely to the Hebrew M. T. with the exception that *οἰδύο* is added by both. This addition is adhered to wherever the New Testament quotes this passage.<sup>1</sup> Alford also notes that they are not in the LXX only but also in the Samaritan Pentateuch.<sup>2</sup> Broadus seems to think that it "expressed emphatically what the original implies".<sup>3</sup> The addition certainly does not impair the original, and adds to the meaning of  $\rho\iota\tau\tau$ , to cleave, or to glue. Several minor differences might be noted further. The LXX has *αὐτοῦ* after *πατέρα* and *νατέρα*, but *τὸν πατέρα* of Matthew can be translated "his father" as well as "the father". Another difference is *προσκοληθήσεται* (LXX D; it changes from LXX A to LXX D here) and *κοληθήσεται* (Matthew). Thayer in his Lexicon lists both words, and says they are translated in the LXX for  $\rho\iota\tau\tau$ .<sup>4</sup>

Our last reference is Matthew 26:31 which is a quotation from Zechariah 13:7. There are several differences between the texts plus an addition in Matthew. Böhl<sup>5</sup> gives us a translation of the LXX A which is similar with Matthew with the exception of *πάταξον*, I aerist impr. 2 p.3. LXX A is a correct translation of the M. T. with the addition of *τῆς ποιμνῆς*. Matthew changes the *πάταξον* to *πατάξω* in order to suit the need of his prophetic context--God is about to smite the shepherd, Christ.

<sup>1</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 729.

<sup>2</sup>Henry Alford, op. cit., p. 193.

<sup>3</sup>John A. Broadus, Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew. (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1886), p. 397.

<sup>4</sup>J. H. Thayer, op. cit., pp. 353, 547.

<sup>5</sup>Edward Böhl, op. cit., p. 68f.



cf. Böhl, "Wir haben hier eine direct messianische Weissagung bei dem Propheten, welche Jesus als in jener Nacht, da er verrathen ward, erfüllt bezeichnet."<sup>1</sup> It is often Matthew's custom to follow the LXX A in preference to the LXX B, even to a departure from the M. T.

Loose citations. - The difference in this group of citations are more apparent and evident. It has been very difficult to single these out of the first group which we have just considered; for they, too, seem to be an adaptation to a prophetic context. However, from the beginning one will immediately note the difference between the groups. Evidently Matthew quoted these passages from memory--not that he did not do so with the foregoing quotations. In these passages his uncertainty of the original text is betrayed, for he quotes a portion from the LXX, then the Hebrew, then a free translation of both, etc. The difficulty in this group lies in endeavoring to determine the source of the citation and its departures.

Our first passage is a good example for this group. Matthew in 2:18 quotes from Jeremiah 31:15. A textual examination will manifest its differences and omissions. He oscillates between the LXX and the Hebrew throughout. Willoughby C. Allen ably points out the differences in the following excerpt:

"φωνή ἐν Παρά=LXX, κλαυθρὸς καὶ ὀδυρρὸς πολὺς  
 represents the LXX θρήνου καὶ κλαυθροῦ καὶ οδυρροῦ. Παῖδες κλαίουσα  
 paraphrases the LXX Παῖδες ἀποχλαυμένης (ης XAQ). Τὰ τέκνα

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid, p. 70.

αὐτῆς inserts from the Hebrew a clause which the LXX omitted, but A Q here ἐπὶ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῆς. Καὶ οὐκ ἤλθελε παρακληθῆναι] So LXX καὶ (A Q) οὐκ ἤλθεν παρακληθῆναι. (B<sup>abmg</sup> A, but B παυσασθαι). Here 'for her children' of the M. T. and LXX B is omitted, with LXX A Q ὅτι οὐκ εἰσίν] so LXX."<sup>1</sup>

Allen further comments and says, "It appears to be a citation from memory of the LXX text."<sup>2</sup> Swete also cites it as an example for a loose citation.<sup>3</sup>

There may be some hesitancy in including this next passage, Matthew 5:31, as a citation because of its vast difference from either the M. T. or the LXX; but it is included by the scholars who have various comments to offer. Böhl claims this is not a citation from the Old Testament but merely a saying, more of a synopsis.<sup>4</sup> But Lenski says that the "ἐρρέθη" is sufficient to mark the fact that Jesus refers to the word of Moses written in Deuteronomy 24:1. Therefore, Jesus summarizes Deuteronomy 24:1 as the Jews did when they assumed that the passage allowed their divorce and demanded that the divorce-certificate be handed to the wife."<sup>5</sup> The beginning words of the passage are probably a paraphrasing of the LXX.<sup>6</sup> The ἀποστασίον refers to a releasing. Matthew's δότω is, no doubt, an adaptation of the LXX's δώσει, "he shall give".

Robertson notes the following regarding ἀποστάσιον:

"Ἀποστάσιον, 'a divorce certificate' (Moffatt) 'a written notice of divorce' (Weymouth). The Greek is an abbreviation of

<sup>1</sup>Willoughby C. Allen, op. cit., p. 16.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 394.

<sup>4</sup>Eduard Böhl, op. cit., p. 30.

<sup>5</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 229.

<sup>6</sup>A. H. McNeile, "Ὁς ἄν..." is perhaps a specimen of the manner in which the Rabbis paraphrased." op. cit., p. 66.



βίβλιον ἀποστασίου. The Vulgate has here libellum repudii. The papyri use συγγράμη ἀποστασίου in commercial transactions as a 'bond of release' (see Moulton and Milligan's Vocabulary etc.)." <sup>1</sup>

The length of our next passage is probably responsible for the sundry differences between the texts. Swete thinks these differences are due to a recension (Theodotion) that Matthew used, and it bore a close relation to the Alexandrian Greek which was in the hands of the Palestinian Church. <sup>2</sup> This is only a probability and its possibility can be doubted. How accurate can a person quote four verses of scripture, especially if they had been given to him by word of mouth? Matthew in 12:18-21 quotes Isaiah 42:1-4 in which he follows the Hebrew save the last line of vs. 21, "in His name". "These and a few minor points are no warrant for the conclusion that Matthew followed some Targum instead of the Hebrew, or had peculiar readings in his Hebrew original. The purpose of the quotation is not a literal reproduction of the original but an application of ancient prophecy to the great beginnings of its fulfillment." <sup>3</sup> The same writer says further, "Matthew translates the thought, and is not hampered by mechanical literalism." <sup>4</sup> An excellent discussion of the differences is given by John A. Broadus in his Commentary on Matthew. <sup>5</sup> Because of its length, it will be unwise to burden our paper with it.

<sup>1</sup>A. T. Robertson, op. cit., p. 46.

<sup>2</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 396.

<sup>3</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 472.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid, p. 474.

<sup>5</sup>J. A. Broadus, op. cit., p. 264f.

There are two problem areas that might be dealt with here. Matthew translates the LXX's εἰς ἀλήθειαν, which follows the M. T. מִבְּרִיָּה, with εἰς ῥῆκος. Some interpreters have devoted a great deal of discussion to this substitution. מִבְּרִיָּה can also mean "firmness, stability, and perpetuity, as well as truth".<sup>1</sup> As Lenski says, "The Hebrew means only 'in reality and truth'; cf. I John 3:18, i. e. with actual success."<sup>2</sup> Jesus, Matthew is saying, will continue steadfast in judgment unto victory.<sup>3</sup> McNeile calls attention to Habbakuk (מְצִיחַ), and claims the מְצִיחַ in Hebrew means "permanence" but in Aramaic "victory", which may have been adopted by the Greek text that Matthew used.<sup>4</sup> Hatch says, "It is conceivable that it may have come to be used as an equivalent for εἰς ἀλήθειαν or ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, 'truly' or 'really'."<sup>5</sup> Matthew closes his quotation with τῷ ὀνόματι, thus following the LXX B but not the Hebrew יְהוָה יְהוָה, "for his law". Here, again, we must needs depart from literalism to interpretation, "since 'hope in his name' amounted to much the same thing as 'wait for his instruction', both denoting dependence upon him."<sup>6</sup> Böhl is probably right in stating that it presupposes a Christian interpretation of the passage.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>William Gesenius, op. cit., p. 69.

<sup>2</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 274.

<sup>3</sup>J. A. Broadus, op. cit., p. 265.

<sup>4</sup>A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 173.

<sup>5</sup>Edwin Hatch, op. cit., p. 201.

<sup>6</sup>J. A. Broadus, op. cit., p. 265.

<sup>7</sup>Eduard Böhl, op. cit., p. 42; also Willoughby Allen, op. cit., pp. 130-131.



Matthew usually follows rather closely the LXX A which, in turn, usually translates the Hebrew accurately. This is true in Matthew 15:8f where he omits ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν which is found in LXX Z, Isaiah 29:13, and the Hebrew, but omitted in LXX A. There can be no doubt that the Hebrew text which the LXX A used had omitted it, for its appearance with τοῖς χείλεσιν "with their lips" is redundant. This is probably an attempt by the copyist to add emphasis to this indictment of Israel. The remaining differences can be elucidated with the explanation from Lenski:

"Out of the much longer sentence Jesus selects only four lines that establish the purpose, namely, to present Jehovah's picture of the hypocrites. Since only these four lines are used, they are properly taken out of the subordinate construction of Isaiah's long, complex sentence and are made ordinary simple statements by the omission of 'forasmuch'."<sup>1</sup>

Difference in translation. - This group contains a few minor variations which cannot be included in any of the foregoing classifications. They are not adaptations to a prophetic context, neither can they be said to be a loose citation. They are an effort on the part of the translator to discern the original meaning.

We begin our consideration of this group with Matthew 4:10 which agrees with the LXX B, Deuteronomy 6:13, and the Hebrew with the exception of two slight differences. Matthew has προσκυνήσεις and μόνῳ. The LXX has φοβήθῃς and omits μόνῳ. The Hebrew can be translated with fear, reverence, or honor. Either of the Greek words may be

---

<sup>1</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 586.

used, but Matthew is probably closer to the Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> The *μόρω* is probably added for emphasis.

To continue our investigation, *Θανάτῳ Τελευτάτῳ* are written in Matthew 15:4; *τελεύτησιν Θανάτῳ* are in the LXX B, Exodus 21:16. Matthew follows LXX A and the order found in it, and is also closer to the M. T. The imperative contains the idea of causation found in the hophal, "he will be caused to die". On the other hand, there is a future element too, as found in the LXX B. The Revised Version in the footnotes has "surely die". Böhl calls our attention to Exodus 21:15-17 in the LXX where the "Formel *πρὶν λῆθ*" is translated with three different "Formeln": *Θανάτῳ Θανατούσθω, τελεύτησιν Θανάτῳ, Θανάτῳ Τελευτάτῳ*.<sup>2</sup>

Another passage comes from Matthew 22:37 with three words, *καρδία, ψυχῇ, διανοία* which follows the M.T., Deuteronomy 6:4, which has *יהוה אחד, יהוה אחד, יהוה אחד*. He translates the *יהוה אחד* "thy might" with the general term "*διανοία*", "the mind". The general term "might" here denotes mental and not physical power.<sup>3</sup> "*Καρδία*" and *διανοία* in the synoptics have the effect of a double rendering of the same Hebrew word: they are sometimes interchanged in LXX text and MSS."<sup>4</sup> Compare the LXX B which translates *יהוה אחד* with *τῆς διανοίας*

<sup>1</sup>Brown, Driver, Briggs, op. cit., p. 431.

<sup>2</sup>Eduard Böhl, op. cit., p. 46.

<sup>3</sup>J. A. Broadus, op. cit., p. 458.

<sup>4</sup>A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 325.



while the LXX A uses  $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\varsigma$  which is followed by Matthew.

In our third passage, Matthew 22:44, Matthew departs from the LXX, Psalm 109:1, which follows the M. T. The Hebrew  $\text{לְחַדְלָנוּ לְמַלְכָּנוּ}$  is translated by Matthew  $\text{ὑποχάτω}$  and LXX  $\text{ὑποπόδιον}$ . Matthew in endeavoring to translate the Hebrew "a stool for thy feet" gives the sense of "under the feet" which is the same sense of a "footstool for thy feet" in LXX. In both cases the thought is the same--the subduing of the enemy under the feet. Böhl says, "Die arabische Uebersetzung hat; 'unter die Spuren deiner Füße', also ähnlich wie Matthäus."<sup>1</sup>

One of the "Last Sayings" of Jesus on the cross composes our last passage of this classification--"My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" - Matthew 27:46. Matthew follows closely again the M. T. and also the LXX A, Psalm 21:1. The LXX B has  $\text{προσχές}$  which differs from the Hebrew radically. Matthew also uses the vocative  $\text{Θεέ μου}$  in preference to the  $\text{Θεός μου}$ . The words as they proceeded from the lips of Jesus, " $\text{ἦ λὶ ἦ λὶ λευὰ σαβαχθαῆν}$ " are Hebrew and Aramaic. The " $\text{ἦ λὶ 'ς}$ " are Hebrew but the remaining words Aramaic. The " $\text{ἦ λὶ}$ " was understood by them, however, though they spoke Aramaic at that time.<sup>2</sup>

Fusing together of passages. - By the fusing together of passages we mean the quoting of one passage and then suddenly branching off into another passage. In Matthew 21:4f, he begins a quotation of Isaiah

<sup>1</sup>Eduard Böhl, op. cit., p. 65.

<sup>2</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 1120.

62:11, "Say to the daughter of Zion, behold (thy salvation cometh)", and then finishes with Zechariah 9:9, "Behold thy king cometh, etc." Undoubtedly he had one passage in mind but confused it with another, or perhaps did it deliberately to suit the occasion. His quotation from Zechariah 9:9 follows the Hebrew with a portion omitted.<sup>1</sup> In fact, he is more accurate than the LXX which further proves that he was not misled by wrong translations in the LXX.<sup>2</sup>

Matthew repeats the same in 21:13 where he begins with Isaiah 56:7, "My house shall be called a house of prayer by all nations," and closes with Jeremiah 7:11, "den of thieves". There are no difficulties here, except, one might wonder where the "den of thieves" could be found in Isaiah. McNeile suggests that Matthew probably omitted the "unto all nations" because "the prophecy was given up as impossible of fulfillment; the temple had been destroyed, and the nations have found another temple in the church".<sup>3</sup>

Although the Evangelist does not use Genesis 38:8 in the twenty-second chapter and the twenty-fourth verse, yet its influence is felt in the ἀπαρτίσει σπέρμα τῷ ἁδελφῷ αὐτοῦ . The quotation is based upon Deuteronomy 25:5, but it bears no similarity to it whatever. Undoubtedly, Matthew had both of the Old Testament passages in mind and quotes them loosely. So thinks Broadus who says, "The quotation is condensed but

---

<sup>1</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 804 in which he gives an interesting reason as to why Matthew omitted the δίκαιος καὶ σωζῶν αὐτός found in LXX Γ and the M. T.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid, p. 804.

<sup>3</sup>A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 299.



without important alterations. Matthew writing especially for Jewish readers, takes pains to translate more exactly the Hebrew, as LXX does in Genesis 38:8."<sup>1</sup>

Difference in order.— Only one passage is catalogued in this classification. Matthew 19:18f has *φονεύσεις, ποιεύσεις, κλέψεις, ψευδομαρτυρήσεις* which follows the order of the Hebrew but not the LXX B, Exodus 20:12-17. However, the LXX A and F have the same order as Matthew. It is evident that Matthew has followed the Alexandrian text as he usually does.

#### Passages Which Differ Widely With The LXX

There are only five passages in this group and none of them are found in Mark, Luke or John. Their differences are so numerous that their similarities are conspicuous. Either Matthew quoted independently of the LXX, or he was influenced by it only slightly.<sup>2</sup> So pronounced is this that Swete further states, "He substituted for it a paraphrase or an independent rendering of the Hebrew."<sup>3</sup> Matthew incorporates all that we have thus far discussed. He adapts a prophetic context, uses a loose citation, or endeavors to translate, all in one citation.

Our first passage in Matthew 2:6 is a classical example for this group. Only a casual reading of Micah 5:2 in the LXX B is necessary to discern the various differences between the two texts. It might be added that the LXX B slavishly follows the M. T. again. Would that Matthew had

<sup>1</sup>J. A. Broadus, op. cit., p. 454.

<sup>2</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 396.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid, p. 398.

done likewise, our problems would all vanish.

Matthew begins with *καὶ σὺ Βηθλέεμ, γῆ Ἰούδα*, which disagrees with the LXX B's *Βηθλέεμ οἴκος Ἐφραθά*. Micah, no doubt, uses the ancient name current in his day, but Matthew is more anxious to locate *Βηθλέεμ* as being in the *γῆ Ἰούδα*.<sup>1</sup> This is what the Sanhedrists were after in answering the king's question. Broadus points out the fact that "Micah, as is often done in poetry, uses an antique name - Bethlehem Ephratah (Genesis 48:7; see on v. 1); Matthew takes the common Old Testament form, Bethlehem-Judah (Ruth 1:1 etc.)."<sup>2</sup>

Matthew continues with *οὐδωρὼς ἐλαφίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγερόσιν Ἰούδα*. Swete thinks *οὐδωρὼς ἐλαφίστη εἶ* is paraphrastic and that the statement is an interpretation rather than a version of the prophecy.<sup>3</sup> Lenski thinks there is no difference in the change from "too little to be among the thousands of Judah" to "by no means least, etc.", for the thought is the same though stated differently.<sup>4</sup> Undoubtedly Matthew is endeavoring to adapt his prophecy as is sometimes the case. However, *ἡγερόσιν* and *χιλιάσιν* need special attention here. *Χιλιάσιν* means "chief of thousand", while *ἡγερόσιν* means simply "a ruler". They are both translations of the same word *׳חלל*, without the points. *׳חלל* can be translated,

<sup>1</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 64.

<sup>2</sup>John A. Broadus, op. cit., p. 19.

<sup>3</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 396.

A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 16.

<sup>4</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 64.



ἐν χιλιάσιν, or 'בִּלְחֵל can be translated ἐν ἡγεμόσιν.<sup>1</sup> The feasibility of this is seen when we recall again that there were no pointings in the Hebrew text that LXX and Matthew used.

Ἐκ σοῦ and ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος as found in Matthew are also in the LXX A Q, but not in LXX B which has ἐξ οὗ μοι and ἐξελεύσεται. Matthew's LXX text evidently was closer to the LXX A and the Hebrew of that text which he unhesitatingly reproduces.

Matthew closes his prophetic citation with ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ which is not found in Micah 5:2. But compare II Samuel 5:2 which in LXX B is ὅστις ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ. "Their final words, 'who shall shepherd the people of Israel', are nothing but an expansion of Micah's words, 'he that is to be ruler in Israel', adapting II Samuel 5:2."<sup>2</sup> The Hebrew מְשִׁיחַ is translated by LXX ἄρχοντα, "ruler" and ἡγούμενος, "the one ruling". Both are correct for the Hebrew participle can be translated as a noun or a participle. Matthew has done the latter which is closer to the Hebrew. Thus Matthew uses foregoing practices: adapting a prophetic context (Βηθλεὲμ, γῆ Ἰούδα), loose citation (οὐδωρῶς), difference in translation (ἡγούμενος), fusing together of passages (Micah 5:2 and II Samuel 5:2), all in one quotation.

The second passage comes from Matthew 4:15f which is a quotation of Isaiah 9:1f, which is again closest to the Hebrew. Matthew, however,

---

<sup>1</sup>Henry Alford, op. cit., p. 13, cf. also Swete, op. cit., p. 396, A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 16.

<sup>2</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 65.

has some points of agreement with both the M. T. and the LXX. Γῆ Ἰαβ., Ἰαλ. τῶν ἐθνῶν, χώρα, σιῆ have LXX influence, while ὁδὸν θαλ., εἶδεν, αὐτοῖς, have M. T. tendencies.<sup>1</sup> Confusion again runs rampant amongst the scholars in their efforts of apologia. Wellhausen attributes it as a "Citat aus Theodotion".<sup>2</sup> McNeile says it is from "a collection of testimonia".<sup>3</sup> Allen speaks of a "Greek version".<sup>4</sup>

Matthew's Γῆ Ἰαβ. and γῆ Νεφ., follow the influence of the LXX as we have already noted. But ὁδὸν θαλάσσης departs from both. If he were translating from the Hebrew, he would have used ὁδός, just like γῆ and not γῆν.<sup>5</sup> The LXX A, however, has ὁδὸν θαλάσσης which, no doubt, Matthew followed. This does not solve our accusative problem. Böhl comes to our rescue with the following:

"In Hebräischen dient bekanntlich der Accusativ, um adverbiale Bestimmungen zu bilden, die nicht mehr unmittelbar vom Verbum regiert werden (Gensenius 118,1). Meyer zeigt übrigens, dass auch die LXX den absoluten Accusativ im Sinne von versus gebrauchen. S. besonders, I. Reg. 18:43: ὁδὸν τῆς θαλάσσης . . . . II Chronicles 6:38: ὁδὸν γῆς αὐτῶν."<sup>6</sup>

He also points out that this is in agreement with the πέρας τοῦ Ἰορδάνου of the LXX.<sup>7</sup> McNeile finds some adverbial accusatives in

<sup>1</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 396f.

<sup>2</sup>J. Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Matthai (Berlin: Druck und Verlag Von Georg Reimer, 1904), p. 11.

<sup>3</sup>A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 44.

<sup>4</sup>Willoughby Allen, op. cit., p. 34.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid, p. 34.

<sup>6</sup>Eduard Böhl, op. cit., p. 25.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid, p. 25.



Numbers 14:25; 21:4; and Deuteronomy 1:40.<sup>1</sup>

Καθήμενος and καθήμενοις of Matthew do not agree with the LXX B, πορεύμενος and κατοικοῦντες which is true to the Hebrew.

Καθῆσθαι, "to sit", is Matthew's translation of  $\text{׀} \text{ׁ} \text{ׂ}$  which is

" . . . . im Hebräischen oft einen Zustand und gleichsam das 'Ergehen'

. . . ."<sup>2</sup>  $\text{׀} \text{ׁ} \text{ׂ}$  can be translated by κατοικοῦντες and also

καθήμενοις.<sup>3</sup> Matthew uses "sit" in both cases to probably agree with the  $\text{׀} \text{ׁ} \text{ׂ}$  of the Hebrew.<sup>4</sup>

Ἀνέτειλεν and λάμψει can be explained with Matthew's endeavor to adapt it to a prophetic context again. They saw the great light, Christ, and to this extent God let it rise for them.<sup>5</sup> The LXX's "shall shine" is, of course, a prophetic future.

Our next passage, Matthew 8:17, is not quite as complicated as the preceding ones. Matthew agrees with the M. T. but not with the LXX  $\Gamma$ , Isaiah 53:4. Matthew, as his practice is, departs from the LXX where it differs from the Hebrew. Smith says that it is an independent version of the Hebrew.<sup>6</sup> Lenski<sup>7</sup> agrees with him, but McNeile pleads his Aramaic

<sup>1</sup>A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 44.

<sup>2</sup>Eduard Böhl, op. cit., p. 26.

<sup>3</sup>J. H. Thayer, op. cit., pp. 313, 341.

<sup>4</sup>A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 44; John A. Broadus, op. cit., p. 75.

<sup>5</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 167.

<sup>6</sup>B. T. D. Smith, op. cit., p. 114.

<sup>7</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 336.

testimonia.<sup>1</sup> In view of past incidents, we could probably conclude that Matthew's LXX which he uses was an exact translation of the Hebrew. On the other hand, the LXX  $\Gamma$  is not a very accurate translation. Cf. Matthew 21:4 with Isaiah 62:11.

Swete says of our next passage that it is "translational and implies an independent use of the original whether by the Evangelist, or by the author of some collection of excerpts which he employed".<sup>2</sup> The first half of our citation, Matthew 13:35, agrees with the LXX B, Psalm 78:2, but the latter half differs. Matthew has ἐρεύξομαι κερυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς; LXX, φθέγξομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.  $\Upsilon\Upsilon\Upsilon$  means to boil, to gush out, and in the hiphil, to utter, publish, or declare. Ἐρεύξομαι and φθέγξομαι are permissible translations of the Hebrew. Κερυμμένα is closer than προβλήματα to  $\Pi\Upsilon\Upsilon' \Pi$ . However, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς is quite far removed from  $\Pi\Upsilon\Upsilon' \Pi$ . Lenski remarks, "This is not a free translation as it is usually termed. It is a frank statement of what the type means regarding the antitype. Asaph's 'dark sayings of old' were for Jesus 'things hidden from the world's foundation'".<sup>3</sup>

Matthew 27:9f is our last citation from Matthew's Gospel. The only similarity we find is "and I took the thirty pieces of silver". Matthew utterly disregards the LXX and the Hebrew in his quotation. He

---

<sup>1</sup>A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 107.

<sup>2</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 394.

<sup>3</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 534.



does, nevertheless, give or approximate the sense of Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> The greatest error lies in the fact that he says it is from Jeremiah, whereas it is nearer Zechariah 11:13. "The slip may be due to the fact that Jeremiah bought a field (32:6f) and went down to the potter's house (18:2)."<sup>2</sup> A similar error is found in Mark 1:2f where the quotation from Isaiah and Malachi is referred to Isaiah.<sup>3</sup> Undoubtedly, Matthew quoted from both Jeremiah and Zechariah using only that which applied to the case at hand--the priests' disposal of the blood-money which could not be placed in the treasury of the temple. Another explanation is suggested by Broadus:

"Hengstenberg thinks that as the later prophets often produce earlier predictions, so Zechariah was here really reproducing Jeremiah 18:2 and 19:2, and Matthew intentionally refers to the original source, though adopting mainly the later form. Besides the above-mentioned fact that Zechariah is so often quoted but never named. Hengstenberg notices also that Mark 1:2f refers to Isaiah what comes from Malachi, giving the older and greater prophet credit for the whole, the two predictions being akin."<sup>4</sup>

Another likely explanation is from Lightfoot as quoted by Lenski:

"One of the older ways of dividing the Scriptures was to begin with the law and to call this part 'The Law'. Next the section commencing with the Psalms was called 'The Psalms' although it contained other writings. The third part began with Jeremiah and included all the other prophets, and yet the whole was called 'Jeremiah'. Lightfoot cites the Baba Bathra and Rabbi David Kimchi's Preface to the prophet Jeremiah as his authorities.-- Horn, Introduction, 7th et. II, 920. Thus any passage taken from this third section of the O. T. would be quoted as coming from 'Jeremiah'.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 397.

<sup>2</sup>B. T. D. Smith, op. cit., p. 205.

<sup>3</sup>A. T. Robertson, op. cit., p. 224.

<sup>4</sup>John A. Broadus, op. cit., p. 559.

<sup>5</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 1082.



Matthew probably leaves the LXX and freely makes changes which clearly bring out the meaning that he thinks are conveyed in the Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> This reminds us of the fact that the Evangelist is not limited to a slavish or mechanical reproduction of the original passage. The interpretative element is often used, but the original sense is maintained. This has been true with the passages considered, more in some than in others.

---

<sup>1</sup>John A. Broadus, op. cit., p. 559.

### CHAPTER III

#### QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK

We now direct our attention to the Gospel of Mark with somewhat of the same method as used in the Gospel of Matthew. Mark has eighteen quotations compared with Matthew's forty. Only two of his quotations are not found in Matthew and Luke--Mark 9:48 and 12:32. Of the remaining sixteen, ten are found in Matthew and Luke, and six are recorded by Matthew, without Luke. It seems as if Mark is the most quoted of the Gospels; and this substantiates the claim that he wrote his Gospel first, and it might have been referred to by Matthew and Luke when they wrote.

#### Passages Which Agree With The LXX

There are five quotations in the Gospel of Mark that agree with the Passages from the LXX. A few minor and slight differences are found in the cases of two, but three of them: 12:10 with Psalms 117:22f; 12:31 with Leviticus 19:18; and 13:14 with Daniel 12:11; are identical. Mark 1:3 is similar with Isaiah 40:3. At the close of the verse, he uses *αὐτοῦ* which differs with the LXX, *τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν*. (cf. Matthew 3:3 for a discussion of this difference.) In our second scripture, Mark 12:26, Mark omits the verb *εἰμί* and in doing so follows the Hebrew *אֲנִי הָאֵל*. The sense is the same in either case.

### Passages Which Disagree Textually With The LXX

The following passages contain textual differences with the LXX. Several of these have already been discussed in the Matthew section and they will be listed in their turn with references noted.

Adapting a prophetic context.— This first passage, Mark 1:2f, has been discussed with its kindred passages in Matthew 11:10 and 3:1. It will be necessary, however, to add a few additional explanations. Mark prefaces this passage as coming from Isaiah; whereas, it is taken from Malachi and Isaiah. The first portion is found in Malachi 3:1 but the latter half comes from Isaiah 40:3. Matthew and Luke use both verses in different parts of their Gospels, but also give the correct citations. This could be taken as a fusion of passages, which it is, but because they are used in different places by Matthew and Luke, we shall treat them separately. A possible explanation has been proposed in the discussion of Matthew 27:9 where a similar error has been made by Matthew. Swete suggests that, "Mark may have depended upon a collection of excerpts in which Malachi 3:1 stood immediately before Isaiah 40:3, possibly on a leaf headed HCIAC. On the use of such collections, see Hatch, Essays, p. 203ff."<sup>1</sup> Robertson notes further, "The Western and Neutral classes read Isaiah, the Alexandrian and Syrian, 'the prophets', an evident correction because part of it is from Malachi. But Isaiah is mentioned as the chief of the prophets. It was common to combine quotations from

---

<sup>1</sup>Henry Barclay Swete, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan and Company, 1898), p. 2.



the prophets in testimonia and catenae (chains of quotations)."<sup>1</sup>

Undoubtedly, Mark knew what he was writing when he proposed the name of only one prophet. If he had actually made a mistake surely one of his readers would have discovered it, and he would have corrected it.<sup>2</sup> For the remaining differences, check the discussion given with Matthew 11:10.

Mark 9:48 is one of Mark's independent quotations. The words were spoken by Jesus, and are a quotation of Isaiah 66:24. Jesus takes the pronouncement of Jehovah's judgment against the wicked and applies it to the punishment of the wicked in Gehenna. (vss. 43,45) He takes it out of the future sphere, *τελευτήσει* and *σβεσθήσεται*, and places it in the present, *τελευτᾷ* and *σβέννυται*. Those whose bodily members give cause for stumbling would be better off without them, rather than to be cast into Gehenna with them. This is not a paper on interpretation nor exposition, but we might note the following: "The 'worm' is internal, and 'fire' external, thus describing the entire suffering of the damned."<sup>3</sup>

There is little to say about our next quotation, Mark 10:6-8. Mark is similar to the LXX with the omission of *καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ*. He uses the same *οἱ δύο* with LXX, Genesis 2:24 and Matthew 19:5f. (cf. Matthew 19:5f).

For our last quotation, Mark 14:27, compare Matthew 26:31. Mark changes the order of *διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα* to

<sup>1</sup>A. T. Robertson, op. cit., p. 252.

<sup>2</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, Interpretations of St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospels (Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1934), p. 17.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid, p. 253.

τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσεται probably because of the omissions of τῆς ποιμένης which is in Matthew's text but not in LXX B.

Loose citations.— Mark, in contrast with Matthew who has several loose citations, has only one which has already been discussed in Matthew 15:8f. Since Mark's passage, Mark 7:6f, is identical with Matthew, it will not be necessary to discuss it here.

Difference in translation.— Mark in 7:10 agrees with Matthew 15:4, with the exception of a minor difference of τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου. Matthew omits the σου after πατέρα and μητέρα but the omission is only incidental, for as already stated, the article alone can be taken for the possessive "thy". An interesting remark is proffered by Swete regarding ὁ κακολογῶν (ⲉⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ) which he says is scarcely to be "he that curseth", though he admits ⲉⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ has this meaning.<sup>1</sup> However, Deuteronomy 27:16, which closely corresponds with Exodus 21:16, ⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓⲛⲓ is represented by ὁ ἁτιμάζων (compare Guillemard on Matthew 15:4). Though this may be feasible, yet the "cursing" is one way of "dishonoring" parents. Undoubtedly the Evangelists understood it in this light, or they would have used ὁ ἁτιμάζων instead of ὁ κακολογῶν. Compare Lenski who says, "In the civil law of the Jews, God placed the death penalty on the mere reviling of a father or a mother (κακολογεῖν, not necessarily 'to curse' although this is included)."<sup>2</sup> The Revised Version reads, "He that speaketh

---

<sup>1</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 140.

<sup>2</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 180.



evil of father or mother."

All of the Evangelists use this next quotation from Mark 12:29f. Each begins with the word *καρδία*, but have changes in the order of the words which follow. Mark, however, has an additional word in his text; *τῆς καρδίας, τῆς ψυχῆς, τῆς διαροίας, τῆς ἰσχύος*. The LXX B has *τῆς διαροίας, τῆς ψυχῆς, τῆς δυνάμεως* which agrees with Mark only in the *τῆς ψυχῆς* in the matter of order. As has already been pointed out, (cf. Matthew 22:37) *καρδίας* and *διαροίας* in the Synoptics have the effect of the double rendering for the same Hebrew word, and in the LXX text and MSS they are used interchangeably.<sup>1</sup> Mark follows the M. T. in his translation of *καρδίας* and *ψυχῆς*, but his insertion of *διαροίας* before *ἰσχύος* is a mystery. Swete would place it at the door of a recension.<sup>2</sup> This is a simple way to explain the Evangelists peculiar action. *Διαροίας* could be intellectual power, while *ἰσχύος* refers to physical power.<sup>3</sup> This is in keeping with the *ἐξ ὅλης*, and would be indicative of his effort to stress the necessity for loving God with our whole being. The LXX's *δυνάμεως* has reference to ability or power.<sup>4</sup> This would further

---

<sup>1</sup>A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 325.

<sup>2</sup>H. B. Swete, Introduction to Old Testament in Greek, p. 394.

<sup>3</sup>J. H. Thayer, op. cit., *διαροία* p. 140; *δύναμις* syn, p. 159f.

<sup>4</sup>Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, A Greek English Lexicon (Oxford at Clarendon Press, Vol. I, *δύναμις*).



substantiate Mark's effort to render the force of the word. Man's ability or power is evaluated in intellectual and physical strength combined. The one, with the exclusion of the other, would produce a handicap upon a person.

Another variation is Mark's use of εἵς<sup>1</sup> which follows the LXX B, but differs with the Gospels of Mark and Luke. The εἵς<sup>2</sup> is closer to the M. T., מִן , than the εἵς<sup>3</sup> . Plummer says, "This use of εἵς<sup>4</sup> is classical; ἀλλ' εἰπερ εἵς τῆς καρδίας (Aristoph. Nub. 86)."<sup>1</sup> εἵς<sup>5</sup> and εἵς<sup>6</sup> seem to be opposite but are really used to express the same idea. εἵς<sup>7</sup> usually denotes sphere, and εἵς<sup>8</sup> refers to source. Thus, if the love of the Lord is "in" the heart, it will come "out" of the heart.<sup>2</sup> Mark merely points to the instrument to be used in our loving of the Lord and not the manner.

It will be necessary only to call the attention to our next passage, as it has been examined in Matthew 22:44. Mark 12:36 is identical with the Matthew passage, but at variance with the LXX.

Only one more passage awaits our attention in this group. Mark 15:34 has been referred to in Matthew 27:46 and treated fairly thoroughly there. Mark, like Matthew, omits the προσέειπεν μοι which has nothing corresponding to it in the M. T.<sup>3</sup> Mark uses εἵς<sup>4</sup> τί<sup>5</sup> instead of the LXX ἵνα τί<sup>6</sup> . The use of ἵνα<sup>7</sup> is usually purpose,

<sup>1</sup>A. Plummer, Cambridge Greek Testament, St. Mark (Cambridge at the University Press, 1938), p. 284.

<sup>2</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 334.

<sup>3</sup>H. B. Swete, Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 303.

however, Dana and Mantey also note that εἰς<sup>1</sup> is sometimes used to indicate purpose especially when used with the infinitive. (cf. Matthew 8:4,34)<sup>1</sup> For the use of the terms ἐλῶι, ἐλῶι, λαμὰ σαβαθαί, see Matthew 27:46. Mark has the Aramaic form instead of the Hebrew probably because of his Gentile readers.

Fusing together of passages.— Our first passage, Mark 11:17, comes from Isaiah 56:7 and Jeremiah 7:11 and has been discussed in Matthew 21:13. Matthew and Luke omit πάντων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν which is kept by Mark. Smith suggests it might be an addition to the text, because Luke and Matthew omit it.<sup>2</sup> But, the majority of scholars believe it to be the expected thing from Mark since he is writing to Gentile Christians. The temple shall be the place for πάντων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, "all the nations", and not for one nation, the Jews.<sup>3</sup> Swete comments further:

"The last words have a special appropriateness in the present context; for the part of the ἱερόν which the Lord had just reclaimed from secular use was the court of the Gentiles, where only within the Precincts Gentiles were at liberty to pray. So far as in them lay, the authorities had defeated the fulfillment of the prophecy; for who could pray in a place which was once a cattle-market and an exchange."<sup>4</sup>

As has been cited before in Matthew 22:24, this passage, Mark 12:19, has been greatly influenced by a special case which fits the

---

<sup>1</sup>H. E. Dana, J. R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: Macmillan Company, 1927), p. 104.

<sup>2</sup>B. T. D. Smith, op. cit., p. 171; cf. A. H. McNeile, op. cit., p. 299.

<sup>3</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 303.

<sup>4</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 241.



injunction found in Deuteronomy 25:5. None of the Synoptists agree with the LXX B, neither do they agree with one another. All that can be said is that the gist of their teaching is the same. The Sadducees who raised the problem had evidently invented its form in order to fit their hyperbole. The Synoptists in order to reproduce it use Deuteronomy 25:5 and Genesis 38:8. Mark speaks of a *τινὸς ἀδελφός* who *καταλίπη γυναικα* (Nestle points these words with the regular type thus omitting them from the citation), and also *μὴ ἀφῆ τέκνον* (a possible case, but what about the seven?). The *λάβει* and *ἐξαναστρέψῃ* suggests the Genesis 38:8 influence.

Mark 12:32 is an independent quotation by Mark following Deuteronomy 4:35 and 6:4. Jesus has just quoted Deuteronomy 6:4 which the scribe refers to in his *εἰς ἓστιν*, but then he continues with Deuteronomy 4:35, *καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλην αὐτοῦ*. This differs from the LXX B (Deuteronomy 4:35) passage, but not enough to alter the meaning. The LXX has *ἐστὶ πλην*, while Matthew has *ἄλλος πλην*. An identical expression is found in Exodus 8:10 (6), *Οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλην*. Mark, no doubt, used this expression, because the LXX A F in Deuteronomy 4:35 has *ἐστὶ* instead of the *ἄλλος* of LXX B, another example of the LXX A influence upon the Synoptists.

Difference in order. - Mark's arrangement of the partial listing of the Ten Commandments, Mark 10:19f, follows the order of the M. T. of Matthew 19:18f and of LXX A F. Another exception must be noted, for Mark adds or closes with *μὴ ἀποστρέψῃς*. This is peculiar to Mark for it is not found in the Synoptists, the LXX B, nor the M. T. In Deuteronomy



24:14 οὐκ ἀπαδixήσεις in the LXX B is translated ἀποστερήσεις LXX A F, thus indicating it is not foreign and unknown to the LXX.

(cf. also Exodus 21:10) Ἀποστερήσῃς is not the tenth commandment, but probably represents it.<sup>1</sup> Plummer seems inclined toward the same.

"It may represent the tenth commandment, or it may be added by Christ as a special warning to the rich man. cf. Exodus 21:10; Malachi 3:5; and Ecclesiastes 4:1, τὴν ἑωτὴν τοῦ πτωχοῦ μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς ."<sup>2</sup>

The sin of defrauding is covetousness, and Jesus undoubtedly with this in mind simply said Μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς .

Mark also varies from the LXX B with the use of μὴ with the subjunctive. The LXX uses οὐ with the future tense. Μὴ with the strong aorist subjunctive is the usual form for the negative command.<sup>3</sup>

This form is also found in James 2:11 (μὴ φονεύσῃς ). The future tense is usually used in setting forth laws which are to be taken in future time.<sup>4</sup> Mark, however, would interpret them from the past to the present, "stop murdering, etc.". The sense is the same, at least so understood that the young man said, "all these things have I kept, etc." cf. Matthew 19:20; Luke 18:21.

<sup>1</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. 211.

<sup>2</sup>A. Plummer, op. cit., p. 239.

<sup>3</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 269.

<sup>4</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 749.

## CHAPTER IV

### QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

Before we begin our examination of the quotations in the Gospel of Luke, some interesting facts should be noted. Luke has the smallest number of quotations of the Gospel writers-- with only seventeen. Of the seventeen, three are independent, i. e., not found in Matthew or Mark. But, ten are found in Matthew and Mark, and four are shared with Matthew alone. He uses the Pentateuch for the majority of his references: five are from Deuteronomy, three from Exodus, and one from Leviticus. Isaiah is second to Deuteronomy with four, and the Psalms share the same number as Exodus with three. Only one of the minor prophets, Malachi, is used. Is this not significant, inasmuch as Luke has Gentile readers in view? Their knowledge of the Old Testament would be limited, and no doubt, the Books of the Law would be of greatest interest. Compare this with our day and the preaching of the Gospel which is found largely in the Gospels, especially John and perhaps Romans. Therefore, our use of the Gospels is obvious. The Epistles are very seldom used, and Revelation is almost forgotten. We shall have more to say about this later.

Luke naturally follows the same pattern as Mark and Matthew, so we shall treat his quotations in the same fashion. However, he does not have a quotation found in the Loose Citation group which might indicate that he is a bit careful in his use of the Scriptures.



### Passages Which Agree With The LXX

Luke has five quotations which agree with the LXX. Three agree verbally: Luke 4:12 with Deuteronomy 6:16; Luke 20:37 with Exodus 3:6; and Luke 20:42f with Psalm 109:1. Luke 4:4 is similar with the exception of the omission of ἀλλ' ἐπὶ..... in Deuteronomy 8:3. The same is true of Luke 20:17 which omits παρὰ κυρίου κτλ. found in Psalm 117:22-23.

### Passages Which Disagree Textually With The LXX

Like the passages cited in Mark, Luke has some which have already been discussed in Matthew or Mark, so they shall merely be listed in their turn.

Adapting a prophetic context.— Our first passage, Luke 4:10, has been discussed in the Matthew 4:6 reference. The quotation is given by Satan and is one of omission. Luke, like Matthew, records the portion which was supposed to have been given by the tempter. Luke does not omit as much as Matthew. His omission of Psalm 91:11f is ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς σου. The recorded portion is identical with the LXX B. The omission is important for the promise was limited to those "righteous only in so far as he walks in the ways of obedience".<sup>1</sup> Jesus would have departed from the ταῖς ὁδοῖς σου of obedience had He yielded to the temptation. "The cunning of the temptation is doubled by the Devil's use of Scripture. The passage he quotes seems to fit the purpose that he makes in a perfect way."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>F. Godet, A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke (Funk and Wagnalls Publishing Company, 3rd ed., 1890), p. 140.

<sup>2</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 630.



Luke 7:27 has already been adequately and sufficiently treated in Matthew 11:10.

Differences in translation.— The first reference is found in Luke 3:4-6 which is taken from Isaiah 40:3-5. The fourth verse agrees with the LXX B verbally. In the fifth verse, Luke uses the plurals *εὐθείας, αἱ τραφεῖαι, ὁδοὺς λείας*; the LXX uses the singulars *εὐθείαν, ἡ τραφεῖα, πεδία*. Probably Luke used the plural to agree with the plural *σκολιά*.<sup>1</sup> The LXX is in error here and Luke follows it but endeavors to correct the text. The Hebrew has *לְרַגְלִי* which is singular and translated by the LXX with *σκολιά* which is plural. These differences may have arisen from the fact that the Hebrew has *לְרַגְלִי*, but *לְרַגְלֵי*, *αἱ τραφεῖαι*, which is plural. There is evidence also that Luke followed the LXX A which omits *πάντα* and also uses *ὁδοὺς λείας* in the place of LXX B's *πεδία*. Some might use this as an indication that Luke was not familiar with the Hebrew like Matthew was, but it is quite possible that he was satisfied with the LXX and thus did not deem it necessary to refer to the Hebrew.<sup>2</sup>

The LXX is further in error in that it translates the *תִּיָּלֶךְ* *לְרַגְלֵי* with *σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ* which Luke also uses.<sup>3</sup> The reason for this is probably interpretative, "the glory consisting in this saving thing (act or gift) of God."<sup>4</sup> Luke probably retained it because it "suits so well the main idea of his Gospel--Jesus the Saviour of all

<sup>1</sup>F. Godet, op. cit., p. 111.

<sup>2</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 594.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid, p. 596.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid, p. 597.

men."<sup>1</sup> Godet thinks the LXX translated it: "The glory of the Lord shall be seen (by the Jews?) and all flesh (including the heathen?) shall see the salvation of God."<sup>2</sup>

Luke 4:8 has been investigated in Matthew 4:10, to which please refer. Some additional comments might be noted. Godet says, "It is obvious that this word serve includes adoration, and therefore the act of  $\pi\rho\sigma\chi\upsilon\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ , falling down in worship, by which it is expressed."<sup>3</sup> "Yare" denotes the fear of reverence, which is expressed by the humble and reverent act of worship."<sup>4</sup>

Luke 10:27 has also been examined in Matthew 22:37 and Mark 12:29. However, the problem is further argued in the commentaries on Luke's Gospel.

Godet says:

" $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ , the heart, in Mark and Luke is foremost, it is the most general term; it denotes in Scripture the central focus from which all the rays of moral life go forth; and in their three principal directions. Moral life proceeds from the heart, and manifests itself without, in the three forms of activity indicated."<sup>5</sup>

Hatch gives these following results:

(1)  $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ,  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\rho\alpha$ ,  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$  are capable of being interchanged as translations of the same Hebrew words:

(2) consequently, the lines of distinction between them, whatever they may be, are not sharply drawn:

---

<sup>1</sup>H. K. Luce, Cambridge Greek Testament, The Gospel According to Luke (Cambridge at the University Press, 1933), p. 109.

<sup>2</sup>F. Godet, op. cit., p. 111.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid, p. 139.

<sup>4</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 628.

<sup>5</sup>F. Godet, op. cit., pp. 306-307.



- (3) a survey of the predicates which are attached to each of them shows a similar impossibility of limiting them to special groups of mental phenomena, with the exception that
- (a) *καρδία* is most commonly used of will and intention,
  - (b) *ψυχή* of appetite and desire.<sup>1</sup>

In our next passage the disagreement is rather minor, but we shall include it in this group. Luke 22:37 has *μετὰ ἀνθρώπων* ; the LXX B Isaiah 53:12 has *ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις* . Both of these prepositions can be translated "with". The Hebrew M. T. has *בְּ* . Dana and Mantey say that a resultant meaning of *μετὰ* with the genitive is "with".<sup>2</sup> Thayer says *ἐν* with the dative can be translated "with, among, in the presence of".<sup>3</sup>

Fusing together of passages.— Our first quotation is one of Luke's independent quotations, Luke 4:18f. It is taken from Isaiah 61:1f with the exception of an omission and an addition from Isaiah 58:6. Luke omits the words found in LXX B, *ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντρίπνους τῆς καρδίας* . He adds the words, *ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει* .<sup>4</sup> Luke may be quoting from memory here as several authorities suggest,<sup>5</sup> or he may have found it already combined with the former. The first suggestion is probably the more

---

<sup>1</sup>Edwin Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1889), p. 108f.

<sup>2</sup>H. E. Dana, J. R. Mantey, op. cit., p. 108.

<sup>3</sup>J. H. Thayer, op. cit., p. 210.

<sup>4</sup>H. K. Luce, op. cit., p. 120. A. T. Robertson, A Translation of Luke's Gospel (New York: George Doran and Company, 1923), p. 159.

<sup>5</sup>A. T. Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament, the Gospel According to Luke, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930) Vol. II, p. 36.

W. F. Burnside, The Gospel According to Luke (Cambridge at the University Press, 1913), p. 110.



feasible.

Although Luke 19:46 is similar with Matthew 21:13 and Mark 11:17, it will be necessary to further comment here. Luke omits the  $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$  τοῖς ἐθέουσιν like Matthew and possibly for the same reasons. Also, he states "my house shall be" instead of "shall be called". Böhl proposes that Luke omits the  $\kappa\lambda\eta\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  because of its "heidnische Ohren harte".<sup>1</sup> But Lenski thinks "house of prayer" gives it a wider sense of worship which Luke wishes to emphasize here.<sup>2</sup>

Luke 20:28, compare Matthew 22:24.

Difference in order.— Luke's order of the commandments, Luke 18:20f, differs from the LXX and the Hebrew. He begins with "adultery" like the LXX but places "murder" next. But this order is not peculiar to Luke alone, for it is found in Romans 13:9 and also in James 2:11. This has led some to believe that it may have been some liturgical or traditional practice.<sup>3</sup> Luke uses the  $\mu\acute{\eta}$  with the aorist subjunction which forbids the single act of sin.<sup>4</sup>

#### Passage With Radical Variances

This passage is one of Luke's independent citations, and like Matthew's five independent citations in this class, presents a hope-

<sup>1</sup>Eduard Böhl, op. cit., p. 55.

<sup>2</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 1083.

<sup>3</sup>H. K. Luce, op. cit., p. 285.

D. Bernhard Weiss, Das Evangelium Lukas (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1902), p. 402.

<sup>4</sup>A. T. Robertson, A Translation of Luke's Gospel, p. 214.

less case for solution. In Luke 2:23, we have the statement καὶ θὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου but its exact location is a mystery. The closest Old Testament passage to it is Exodus 13:12, and it seems as if Luke used portions of several passages in this thirteenth chapter. Our trouble lies in the fact that the LXX B differs with the Hebrew. Ἀρσενικά is not found in the M. T., but has been added by the LXX. Luke, in order to retain it, places it in his quotation along with the idea of separation. The M. T. has  $\overline{\text{פ}}\overline{\text{ר}}\overline{\text{א}}\overline{\text{ר}}\overline{\text{א}}\overline{\text{ר}}\overline{\text{א}}$ , hiphil causative whose meaning is "to cause to pass over" from which is construed the idea of separation or consecration.<sup>1</sup> Luke gives a rather loose and free translation of this word in ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται. The LXX translates it with ἀφελεῖς. It is possible that Luke quoted from 13:2,12; at least Weiss, Robertson, Lenski and Zahn think so.<sup>2</sup> Böhl goes so far as to postulate the use of Numbers 18:15, καὶ πᾶν διανοίγον μήτρων, and this was his explanation to Theophilus of Exodus 13:2.<sup>3</sup> These efforts of explanation are good, but the solution lies within the text. Luke uses a loose citation, endeavors to translate, and to adapt it to the prophetic context.

---

<sup>1</sup>William Gesenius, op. cit., p. 745.

<sup>2</sup>D. Bernhard Weiss, op. cit., p. 292f.

A. T. Robertson, op. cit., p. 150.

R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 570.

Theodor Zahn, Das Evangelium des Lucas (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1913), p. 149, footnote p. 61.

<sup>3</sup>Eduard Böhl, op. cit., p. 82.

## CHAPTER V

### COMPARISON OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

Now that we have completed our examination of the quotations from the LXX as found in Matthew, Mark and Luke, let us compare these quotations in the light of their occurrence in the Synoptic Gospels. It has been rather difficult to discuss a quotation from the LXX as found in Matthew without making reference to it as it occurs in another Gospel. That there are differences, only a casual perusal of the Gospel quotations will reveal. These can be expected because each writer has a different group of people in mind. Luke was writing to a Theophilus<sup>1</sup> who evidently had inquired concerning the life of Jesus. Luke's background was different, too. He was a companion of Paul, and, no doubt, received a goodly amount of his knowledge from him.<sup>2</sup> Mark also writes for Gentiles but from a Petrine point of view, for Mark probably received much of what he wrote from Peter.<sup>3</sup> Matthew, of course, wrote from a Jewish point of view.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 1:3.

<sup>2</sup>Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896), p. xxlii.

<sup>3</sup>Samuel A. Cartledge, A Conservative Introduction to the New Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing Company, 1941), pp. 73, 76.

<sup>4</sup>Alfred Plummer, op. cit., p. xliii.



There are twenty passages which are shared by the Synoptists; this is almost half of the total number of quotations which is forty-four. Of these, one-half of them are shared by Matthew, Mark and Luke; Matthew and Mark share six and Matthew and Luke only four. Mark and Luke do not have any to the exclusion of Matthew. It will also be interesting to note that those shared by Matthew and Luke come exclusively from the Wilderness Temptation which is mentioned by Mark with only two verses.<sup>1</sup>

#### Passages Which Are Similar

By passages that are similar, is meant those which are so nearly alike that the differences are minor. There are fourteen passages which are similar and they are listed as follows:

Matthew	Mark	Luke
3:3	1:3	3:4-6
4:4		4:4
4:6		4:10
4:7		4:12
4:10		4:8
11:10	1:2	7:27
15:4	7:10	
15:8f	7:6f	
19:5f	10:6f	
22:32	12:26	20:37
22:39	12:31	10:27b
21:42	12:10	20:17
24:15	13:14	
26:31	14:27	

Matthew is identical with Mark in three passages and with Luke in one: Matthew 15:4 with Mark 7:10; Matthew 15:8f with Mark 7:6f;

---

<sup>1</sup>Mark 1:12,13.

Matthew 24:15 with Mark 13:14; and Matthew 4:7 with Luke 4:12.

Matthew 3:3, Mark 1:3, and Luke 3:4 are identical, but Luke adds verses five and six possibly because of his desire to emphasize *τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ* which "suits with the main idea of his Gospel-- Jesus the Saviour of all men".<sup>1</sup>

Matthew adds the words, "but upon every word that comes from the mouth of God", in Matthew 4:4; but Luke 4:4 omits them and simply says, "man shall not live by bread alone". Matthew is not in error here, for he is in agreement with LXX B. Evidently the whole of Deuteronomy 8:3 appealed to him, so he uses it. He may also have used it to stress the need of dependence upon God.

Luke 4:10 is identical with Matthew 4:6 but for the addition of *τοῦ διαφολάξαι σε*. The *ὅτι* following the *καί* is the same as our quotation marks. Luke calls our attention to what the *ἐντελεῖται* is to be, and thus is more specific. He does not depart from the LXX in doing so.

Mark fails in this next passage to a certain extent. Mark 1:2 does not contain an *ἐμπροσθέν σου* at the end of the quotation but it is retained by Matthew 11:10 and Luke 7:27. The omission does not change the thought, and merely points out the way as being before him. But, one's way is always before him. Matthew also has *ἐγώ* probably for emphasis.

In our next passage, Mark 10:6-8 follows LXX A in omitting

---

<sup>1</sup>H. K. Luce, op. cit., p. 109.

προσχωληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ , while Matthew 19:5f follows LXX D in the addition.<sup>1</sup> LXX D also agrees with the M. T. Mark's text evidently omitted it, or he purposely omitted it; for it does not affect the meaning of the quotation.

Matthew 22:32, Mark 12:26, Luke 20:37 have only minor differences which can be attributed to the context. Matthew has ἐγώ εἰμι , Mark has ἐγώ , and Luke omits both. The remainder of the passages is verbatim.

Matthew 22:39, Mark 12:31, and Luke 10:27 are alike, but for Luke's omission of ἀγαπήσεις which, however, begins the beginning of verse 27, "Thou shalt love, etc."

Another example finds Matthew 21:42 and Mark 12:10 identical but Luke 20:17 omits the words following γυνίης . Matthew and Mark quote Psalm 117:22,23 but Luke quotes only verse 22. Plummer suggests that Luke would not have omitted this reference to the believing and loyal Gentiles if he had known it.<sup>2</sup> Undoubtedly Luke knew of this verse, but preferred not to use it for reasons obvious to himself.

Matthew 26:31 and Mark 14:27 have been considered under the Matthew reference. We accept them as similar, although the latter half of Mark has been rearranged from the order found in Matthew 4:10.

<sup>1</sup>H. B. Swete, op. cit., p. lxxiii.

<sup>2</sup>Alfred Plummer, op. cit., p. 462.



### Passages Which Differ

Our first passages, Matthew 19:18f, Mark 10:19f, Luke 18:20f, differ as to order, and this can possibly be attributed to memory. The following chart will help us in seeing the difference at a glance.

<u>Hebrew</u>	<u>LXX B</u>	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Luke</u>
Kill	Adultery	Kill	Kill	Adultery
Adultery	Steal	Adultery	Adultery	Murder
Steal	Kill	Steal	Steal	Steal
False Witness	False Witness	False Witness	False Witness	False Witness

The reason for these differences has been considered under their respective references.

In our next passages, Matthew 21:13 omits the *πᾶσιν τοῖς ἑθνεσιν* of Mark 11:17, and so does Luke 19:46 who omits also *κληθήσεται*. Luke uses *ἔσται*, and the reason has been presented under the Luke reference. References should also be checked for Matthew and Mark. The answer is probably contextual. Mark widens the scope for the "house of prayer", and Luke merely calls attention to it as a "house of prayer". Matthew could very easily have used Mark and omitted "for all nations", because this would not have pleased his readers.

A free and loose quotation is the nomenclature for our next group of passages: Matthew 22:24, Mark 12:19, Luke 20:28. Each of the Evangelists point out a particular detail about the man who died. Matthew thinks the marriage of the brother to the widow is important. Mark makes prominent the leaving of the wife with no children. Luke attaches consequence to the fact that the man had a wife but is child-

less. All of this amounts to the same thing, but it is said in a different way.

There are several differences between Matthew 22:37, Mark 12:29 and Luke 10:27a. These have already been settled, as they were compared with the LXX Deuteronomy 6:4. The following table will help:

<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Luke</u>
καρδία	καρδίας	καρδίας
ψυχή	ψυχή	ψυχή
διαοία	διαοίας	ἰσχύϊ
	ἰσχύος	διαοία

The reason has been given as a difference in translation. Matthew follows the LXX A and Hebrew in giving three. Luke probably follows Mark who divides the LXX B's δυνάμεις into mental and physical power.

Matthew 22:44 and Mark 12:36 are identical, but Luke 20:42 has ὑποπόδιον instead of ὑποκάτω. Both Matthew and Mark have ὑποπόδιον in some uncial manuscripts which may have been the reason that Luke uses it. LXX B has ὑποπόδιον but LXX A has ὑποκάτω ; and is followed by Matthew and Mark.

The last passage for this chapter is found in Matthew 27:46 and Mark 15:34. The differences have already been considered as a difference in translation--cf. the references. Mark uses the Aramaic interpretation probably because of his readers, but Matthew uses both Aramaic and Hebrew which were readily recognized and accepted by the Jews.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSION

It will be interesting, at this point of our treatise of the Old Testament quotations, to bring to a conclusion our research and note some of the results that accrue from the material. We shall follow the order of our paper by beginning with Matthew's use of the LXX and the M. T. Up to the present, we have dealt with his agreements and disagreements with both texts. A tabulation of those results will help us to fix securely his method of utilizing the Old Testament quotations. The same should be true of Mark and Luke. Then, a treatment of the Synoptists as they relate to each other will follow.

Matthew has fifteen passages agreeing verbally with the LXX B, which suggests the use of this manuscript or its quotation from memory as a basis in writing his book. However, he uses forty quotations, and this cannot be said of all of them; because they depart from the LXX B and even, at times, from the M. T. Attention has been called to the fact that Matthew leans toward the LXX A which, at times, disagrees with the M. T. and is closer to the original LXX. This may be the answer for much of our translational difficulties, as already discussed. Many of the scholars postulate the use of other sources as the answer, but their postulations are not satisfactory. This is seen from the fact that they agree he used the LXX; but when he departs from it, they attribute it to



various sources.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps a few examples may further strengthen the assertion that Matthew's manuscript was closer to the original and thus make the differences in many of his citations. In Matthew 2:15, he departs from the LXX B's translation of  $\tau\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\alpha$  and uses  $\upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$  which is also used by the M. T. Undoubtedly, Matthew's text had it, and therefore he uses it. The same is true of Matthew 11:10 where he departs from LXX B and adheres closely to the M. T. cf. also 4:10, 15:4, and 22:37. In these references, he follows the LXX A, also, as well as the M. T. In addition, there are some cases in which he leaves the M. T. as well as LXX B, and Matthew 15:8 is one example. However, LXX A  $\phi\ \chi$  supports him, and this means that in Matthew's time, the text that he used differed with the M. T. and LXX B. Matthew 22:44 is another example where he differs with M. T. and the printed Greek text LXX  $\chi$ . Again, Matthew's text probably contained this difference.

Although we have endeavored to explain these differences by placing them under the various classifications, yet one feels the inadequacy of the effort. The fact still remains that Matthew records his quotation with different words, phrases, and clauses than the LXX and the

---

<sup>1</sup>A. H. McNeile, op. cit., an Aramaic testimonia, p.9.

Eduard Böhl, op. cit., an Aramaic volksbibel, p. 5.

H. B. Swete, op. cit., a recensional (Theodotion) that Matthew used and having a close relation to the Alexandrian Greek which was in the hands of the Palestinian Church, p. 30.

Willoughby Allen, op. cit., speaks of a Greek version, p. 34.

M. T. How much we can attribute to memory, is impossible to ascertain. Whether he used an Aramaic Targum, or the Hebrew Bible, or even a Greek Version, not the LXX, will have to remain unsolved until a later date. Matthew's sources have been buried in the dust of antiquity and await the scholar's spade. Toy may have been right in his assertion that the LXX followed the New Testament text.<sup>1</sup> We feel that Matthew differs with the LXX and M. T. because his LXX text differed, and it was undoubtedly closer to the original LXX manuscript.

What has been said for Matthew can also be applied to Mark, for they agree substantially. Perhaps it might have been more logical to consider Mark first and then Matthew, since it is agreed that Matthew used Mark when he wrote. Mark, too, follows the LXX A rather than the LXX B, even though it may differ with the M. T.

There is no doubt that Luke used only Greek sources and not Hebrew or Aramaic which is possible in Matthew and Mark.<sup>2</sup> In at least one instance, he follows the LXX A even though it disagrees with the LXX B and M. T. cf. Luke 3:4-6.<sup>3</sup> He follows the LXX A and corrects its grammatical errors. Toy thinks the LXX A has probably been conformed to Luke's text.<sup>4</sup> Thus, in contrast to Matthew and Mark, he follows the

<sup>1</sup>Crawford Howell Toy, Quotations in the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884), p. 4; cf. also his Introduction.

<sup>2</sup>Alfred Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. lii.

<sup>3</sup>cf. also Luke 4:18.

<sup>4</sup>Crawford Howell Toy, *op. cit.*, p. 19.



LXX and not the M. T., even though the M. T. is more correct than the LXX. Some maintain that he did not know the Hebrew; but it is quite possible he was satisfied with the LXX, and did not deem it necessary to refer to the Hebrew.<sup>1</sup>

The differences between the Synoptists are those of omission or addition. Most of the additions are in Matthew and Luke. Mark usually uses the shorter of the passages. This would indicate that they used Mark or the same source that Mark did. On at least one occasion, Matthew and Luke omit a portion that Mark keeps. cf. Matthew 21:13, Mark 11:17, Luke 19:46. In still another, they are alike in substance, but elect to stress a particular phase of the passage. cf. Matthew 22:24, Mark 12:19, Luke 20:28. Where there are textual differences, Matthew and Luke will differ but Mark will always agree with one of them. This further verifies Mark as the basis for Matthew and Luke.

In the main, the quotations point to a common source. Undoubtedly, the LXX A is closer to that source than LXX B and M. T. However, at times, LXX B and M. T. seem to be more accurate. The textual differences may be attributed to the fact that their manuscripts contained copyist errors, or they can be catalogued under one of the classifications used.

---

<sup>1</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, op. cit., p. 594.



## LIST OF QUOTATIONS IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Luke</u>	<u>Old Testament</u>
1:23			Isaiah 7:14
		2:23	Exodus 13:12
2:6			Micah 5:2
2:15			Hosea 11:1
2:18			Jeremiah 38:15; 31:15
3:3	1:3	3:4-6	Isaiah 40:3-5
4:4		4:4	Deuteronomy 8:3
4:6		4:10f	Psalms 91:11f
4:7		4:12	Deuteronomy 6:16
4:10		4:8	Deuteronomy 6:13
4:15f			Isaiah 9:1f
5:21			Exodus 20:13
5:27			Exodus 20:14
5:31			Deuteronomy 24:1
5:38			Exodus 21:24
5:43			Leviticus 19:18
8:17			Isaiah 53:4
9:13			Hosea 6:6
11:10	1:2	7:27	Malachi 3:1
12:7			Hosea 6:6
12:18-21			Isaiah 42:1-4
13:14f			Isaiah 6:9f
13:35			Psalms 78:2
		4:18f	Isaiah 61:1f; 58:6
15:4	7:10		Exodus 20:12; 21:16
15:8f	7:6f		Isaiah 29:13
	9:48		Isaiah 66:24
19:5f	10:6-8		Genesis 1:27; 2:24
19:18f	10:19f	18:20f	Exodus 20:12-17
21:4f			Zachariah 9:9, Isaiah 62:11
21:13	11:17	19:46	Isaiah 56:7, Jeremiah 7:11
21:16			Psalms 8:2
21:42	12:10	20:17	Psalms 117:22f
22:24	12:19	20:28	Deuteronomy 25:5 (Genesis 38:8)

## List of Quotations (Continued)

22:32	12:26	20:37	Exodus 3:6
22:37	12:29f	10:27a	Deuteronomy 6:4f
22:39	12:31	10:27b	Leviticus 19:18
22:44	12:36	20:42f	Psalms 109:1
	12:32		Deuteronomy 4:35; 6:4
24:15	13:14		Daniel 12:11
		22:37	Isaiah 53:12
26:31	14:27		Zechariah 13:7
27:9f			Zechariah 11:13
27:46	15:34		Psalms 21:1

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BOOKS

- Böhl, Eduard. Die Alttestamentlichen Citate in Neuen Testament. Wein: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1878.
- Cartledge, Samuel A. A Conservative Introduction to the New Testament. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1941.
- Deissmann, G. Adolf. Bible Studies. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1901.
- Duhm, B. Die Entstehung Des Alten Testaments. Freiberg i. b. und
- Edersheim, Alford. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. Vol. I, 8th ed. New York: Longmans, Henry and Co., 1910.
- Fairbairn, Patrick. Hermeneutical Manual. Philadelphia: Smith, English and Company, No. 40 N. Sixth Street, 1859.
- Frankel, Z. Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta. Leipzig: bei Fr. Chr. Wilh. Vogel, 1841.
- Hatch, Edwin. Essays in Biblical Greek. Oxford at Clarendon Press, 1889.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. Sources of New Testament Greek. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 38 George Street, 1895.
- Kirkpatrick, A. F. The Divine Library. 11th ed. Macmillan and Co., 1911.
- New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, Vol. II. Edited by Samuel M. Jackson. Funk and Wagnalls, 1908.
- Otley, Richard R. A Handbook to the Septuagint. London: Methuen and Co., 1920.
- Pearce, Abigail. The Scripture in the Making. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1927.
- Price, Ira M. The Ancestry of Our English Bible. 11th ed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY ( CONTINUED)

Robertson, A. T. A Harmony of the Gospels. Nashville, Tennessee:  
Broadman Press, 1922.

An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.  
2nd ed. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran and Co., 1928.

Schaff, Philip. A Companion to the Greek Testament and the English Version.  
New York: Harper and Brothers, 1883.

Stuart, M. Passages Cited from the Old Testament by the Writers of the New Testament. Andover: Flogg and Gould Publishing Co., Cadman Press, 1827.

Swete, Henry Barclay. An Introduction to the Old Testament in the Greek.  
Cambridge at the University Press, 1900.

Tasker, R. V. G. The Old Testament in the New Testament. Philadelphia:  
Westminster Press, 1947.

Toy, Crawford Howell. Quotations in the New Testament. New York:  
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884.

Willoughby, H. R. The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow. Chicago:  
University of Chicago Press, 1947.

## COMMENTARIES

## Matthew

Alford, Henry. The Greek New Testament, The Four Gospels. Vol. I, 6th ed.  
Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1868.

Allen, Willoughby. International Critical Commentary, Matthew. New York:  
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

Broadus, John A. Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew. Philadelphia:  
American Baptist Publication Society, 1886.

Lenski, R. C. H. Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel. Columbus, Ohio:  
The Wartburg Press, 1943.

McNeile, A. H. Gospel According to Matthew. London: Macmillan and Co.,  
1938.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY (CONTINUED)

- Meyer, H. A. W. A Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Gospel of Matthew. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1884.
- Robertson, A. T. Word Pictures in the New Testament, Matthew and Mark. Vol. I., New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930.
- Robinson, Theodore. Moffat New Testament Commentary, Gospel of Matthew. New York: Harper and Brothers Pub., 1927.
- Smith, B. T. D. Cambridge Greek Testament, Matthew. London: Cambridge at the University Press, 1927.
- Vincent, Marvin. Word Studies in the New Testament, Synoptic Gospels. Vol. I. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.
- Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Matthaei. Berlin: Druck und Verlag Von Georg Reimer, 1904.

## Mark

- Alford, Henry. The Greek Testament, The Four Gospels. 6th ed., Vol. I. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1868.
- Lenski, R. C. H. Interpretation of St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospels. Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1934.
- Plummer, A. Cambridge Greek Testament, St. Mark. Cambridge at the University Press, 1938.
- Rawlinson, A. E., Jr. Westminster Commentaries, St. Mark. 2nd ed. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1927.
- Robertson, A. T. Word Pictures in the New Testament, Matthew and Mark. Vol. I. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Macmillan and Co., 1898.
- Vincent, Marvin. Word Studies in the New Testament, Synoptic Gospels. Vol. I., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.
- Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Marcai. Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1903.
- Wendlig, Emil. Die Entstehung des Marcus-Evangeliums. Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen, 1908.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY ( CONTINUED)

## Luke

- Alford, Henry. The Greek Testament, The Four Gospels, 6th ed. Vol. I. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1868.
- Burnside, W. F. The Gospel According to Luke. Cambridge at the University Press, 1913.
- Creed, John Martin. The Gospel According to Luke. London: Macmillan and Company, 1930.
- Godet, F. A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke. Funk and Wagnalls Pub., 1890. 3rd ed.
- Lenski, R. C. H. Interpretation of St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospels. Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1934.
- Luce, H. K. Cambridge Greek Testament, The Gospel According to Luke. Cambridge at the University Press, 1933.
- Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.
- Robertson, A. T. A Translation of Luke's Gospel. New York: George Doran and Company, 1923.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Word Pictures in the New Testament, The Gospel According to Luke. Vol. II. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930.
- Vincent, Marvin. Word Studies in the New Testament, Synoptic Gospels. Vol. I. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918.
- Weiss, Bernhard D. Das Evangelium Lukas. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1902.
- Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Lucae. Berlin: Druck und Vorlag von Georg Reiner, 1904.
- Zahn, Theodor. Das Evangelium des Lucas. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf., 1913.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY ( CONTINUED)

## DICTIONARIES AND GRAMMARS

- Brown, Driver, Briggs. Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.  
New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1906.
- Dana, H. E., and Mantey, J. R. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament.  
New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927.
- Gesenius, William. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.  
12th ed. Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1866.
- Hastings, James. A Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. IV. New York:  
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Scott, Robert. A Greek English Lexicon.  
Vol. I and II. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, (no date).
- Thayer, J. H. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Corrected  
edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1892.

## ARTICLES

- Hoffman, Donald L. A Critical Examination of ׀׀׀ as it Occurs in the  
Masoretic Text of the Old Testament Studied in Light of the  
Septuagint. Unpublished Master's Dissertation, Department of  
Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, 1942.
- Pellett, David C. A Critical Study of the Scribal Errors in the Book  
of Jeremiah in the Light of the Septuagint. Unpublished Master's  
Dissertation, Department of Religion, Butler University,  
Indianapolis, 1937.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY (CONTINUED)

## BIBLES

Hebrew Bible, Made in England, 1929.

Nestle, Erwin. Greek New Testament. American Bible Society, 16th ed., 1935.

Swete, Henry Barclay. The Old Testament in the Greek According to the Septuagint. Cambridge at the University Press,

Volume I, 4th ed., 1909.

Volume II, 3rd ed., 1907.

Volume III, 4th ed., 1912.

Westcott and Hort. The New Testament in the Original Greek. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1941.